

<b>I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>III. STATUS OF CLAIMS.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>VII. ARGUMENT.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>VIII. CLAIMS APPENDIX .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>IX. EVIDENCE APPENDIX .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>X. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX .....</b>	<b>22</b>

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

In re Application of	:	Customer Number: 46320
	:	
Gabriel COHEN	:	Confirmation Number: 8004
	:	
Application No.: 10/686,487	:	Group Art Unit: 2176
	:	
Filed: October 15, 2003	:	Examiner: J. Debrow
	:	
For: INDICATING FOCUS IN A PORTAL ENVIRONMENT		

**APPEAL BRIEF**

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This Appeal Brief is submitted in support of the Notice of Appeal filed February 28, 2007, wherein Appellant appeals from the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-16.

**I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST**

This application is assigned to IBM Corporation by assignment recorded on October 15, 2003, at Reel 014618, Frame 0419.

**II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

Appellant is unaware of any related appeals and interferences.

### **III. STATUS OF CLAIMS**

Claims 1-16 are pending and finally rejected in this Application. It is from the final rejection of claims 1-16 that this Appeal is taken.

### **IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS**

The claims have not been amended subsequent to the imposition of the Third Office Action dated November 28, 2006 (hereinafter the Third Office Action).

### **V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER**

Referring to Figure 3 and to independent claims 1 and 12, a method for indicating input focus in a portal environment is disclosed. An unfocused style is assigned to all unfocused portlets in a portal except for a focused portlet having input focus (page 12, lines 6-10 of Appellant's disclosure). In block 350, a focused style is assigned to the focused portlet having input focus (page 12, lines 21-23). In block 360, the focused and unfocused portlets in the portal are rendered (page 12, line 23 through page 13, line 3). Responsive to a new portlet in the portal acquiring the input focus from the focused portlet, in block 350, re-assigning the focused style to the new portlet (page 12, lines 21-23) while, in block 330, re-assigning the unfocused style to the focused portlet which no longer has input focus (page 12, lines 17-19). In block 360, the new portlet and the focused portlet which no longer has input focus are re-rendered in the portal according to the styles (page 12, line 23 through page 13, line 5).

Referring to Figure 2 and to independent claim 6, a system for indicating input focus in a portal environment is disclosed. The system includes a focused style sheet 210, an unfocused style sheet 220 (page 11, lines 4-5), a portal 250, a global indicator 260, and a global script 270.

The portal 250 defines a plurality of portlets 230 (page 10, lines 15-16). The portlets 230 comprise a single focused portlet 230 configured for rendering according to the focused style sheet 210, and a remaining set of unfocused portlets 230 configured for rendering according to the unfocused style sheet 210 (page 12, lines 3-10). The global indicator 260 is disposed within the portal 250 to specify the single focused portlet (page 12, lines 5-6). The global script 270 is disposed within the portal 250 and is programmed to change the global indicator 260 to specify a newly focused portlet 230 when the newly focused portlet 230 acquires input focus from the single focused portlet 230 (page 12, lines 13-14). The global script 270 is also programmed to re-render the newly focused portlet 230 in the portal 250 according to the focused style sheet 210 and to re-render the single focused portlet 230 in the portal 250 according to the unfocused style sheet 220 (page 12, lines 23 through page 13, line 5).

## **VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL**

1. Claims 1-2, 6-7, 10-13, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for obviousness based upon Fukuda et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0107449 (hereinafter Fukuda), in view of Gajewska et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0175951 (hereinafter Gajewska);

2. Claims 3, 5, 9, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for obviousness based upon Fukuda in view of Gajewska and Ito et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0084405 (hereinafter Ito); and

3. Claims 4, 8, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for obviousness based upon Fukuda in view of Gajewska, Ito and further in view of Griffin, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0126558 (hereinafter Griffin).

## **VII. ARGUMENT**

### **THE REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-2, 6-7, 10-13, AND 16 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 FOR OBVIOUSNESS BASED UPON FUKUDA IN VIEW OF GAJEWSKA**

For convenience of the Honorable Board in addressing the rejections, and claims 2, 6-7, 10-13, and 16 stand or fall together with independent claim 1.

At the outset, Appellant notes that on pages 3-14 of the Third Office Action, the Examiner newly rejected claims 1-2, 6-7, 10-13, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for obviousness based upon Fukuda in view of Gajewska. On the contrary, in the Second Office Action dated June 6, 2006 (hereinafter the Second Office Action), the Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 6-7, 10-13, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for obviousness based upon Gajewska in view of Fukuda. On pages 24 and 25 of the Third Office Action, the Examiner addresses Appellant's prior arguments with regard to the rejection based upon Gajewska in view of Fukuda. However, based upon the Examiner's comments (or lack thereof), Appellant is unclear as to whether the Examiner is maintaining the rejection of claims 1-2, 6-7, 10-13, and 16 based upon Gajewska in view of Fukuda or substituting the new rejection of the claims based upon Fukuda in view of Gajewska in place of the old rejection of the claims based upon Gajewska in view of Fukuda.

Notwithstanding this ambiguity, Appellant will address both rejections. It appears that the Examiner is relying on the same features in the same references for both rejections and the only discernable difference between these different rejections is the stated motivations to combine.

On page 3 of the Third Office Action with regard the teachings of Fukuda, the Examiner asserted the following:

*assigning an unfocused style to all unfocused portlets in a portal except for a focused portlet having input focus* (0064; Fukuda teaches a focus style is configured such that a style sheet is used to specify the style of the focus. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art that Fukuda teaching of a focus style sheet as applied to a focused portlet could also be applied as an unfocused style sheet to an unfocused portlet.) (italics in original) (underlines added).

Upon comparing the above passage to the Examiner's statement of the rejection on page 4 of the Second Office Action with regard to the same claimed limitation, the above-underlined portion of this passage is the only difference between the statement of the rejections.

In the last full paragraph on page 4 of the Request for Reconsideration dated September 7, 2006, Appellant presented the following arguments with regard to the Examiner citing paragraph [0064] of Fukuda to teach the limitation identified in italics in the above-reproduced passage.

Notwithstanding Gajewska not teaching those limitations for which Gajewska is being relied upon in the statement of the rejection to teach, Appellant notes that the Examiner cited paragraph [0064] of Fukuda to teach the limitations reproduced above. Paragraph [0064] refers to Fig. 7, which does not illustrate portlets in a portal environment, given the ordinary and customary meanings of those terms by one having ordinary skill in the art. Instead, Fig. 7 and paragraph [0064] of Fukuda teach the display of "streaming programs 702," which have not been established by the Examiner to be comparable to the claimed portlets.

Moreover, the claimed invention recites that the focused/unfocused style is assigned to the portlets (either the focused portlet or the unfocused portlet). Fukuda, however, does not

teach or suggest these limitations. Instead, Fukuda teaches that a focus 704 is "shifted by using the cursor keys 202 of the remote control unit 116." Although Fukuda teaches that "a style sheet is used to specify the style of the focus," Fukuda is silent as to the style being applied to one of the streaming programs 702 (i.e., the Examiner's alleged portlets). Instead the style found in the style sheet is applied to the focus 704. Still further, although Fukuda teaches a style sheet used with a focus 704 (i.e., the Examiner's alleged "focused style"), the Examiner has failed to establish that Fukuda teaches the claimed "unfocused style."

The Examiner's response to these arguments in the Second Response is found in the paragraph spanning pages 25 and 26 of the Third Office Action and reproduced below:

Again, the applicant is trying show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. As stated above Fukuda teaches a focus style is configured such that a style sheet is used to specify the style of the focus. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art that Fukuda teaching of a focus style sheet as applied to a focused portlet could also be applied as an unfocused style sheet to an unfocused portlet (0064) (emphasis added)

At the outset, Appellant is unclear as to why arguing Fukuda fails to disclose a particular feature for which the Examiner is relying upon Fukuda to teach is improper.

For example, if the Examiner admits that Reference A fails to teach or suggest features X and Y, and the Examiner then relies upon Reference B to teach features X and Y, then the Examiner is not relying upon the combination of references A and B to teach features X and Y. Instead, the Examiner is relying solely on Reference B to teach features X and Y. Therefore, it is proper for Appellant to argue that Reference B fails to teach features X and Y. This is exactly what Appellant has done in the Second Response. At the very top of page 4 of the Second Office Action, the Examiner admits that Gajewska fails to disclose certain claimed features. Then Examiner then relies solely upon Fukuda to teach these features. Thus, the Examiner is not

relying upon the combination of references A and B to teach these particular features. Instead, the Examiner is relying solely upon Fukuda to teach these features.

With regard to the substance of the Examiner's argument, Appellant notes that the underlined portion above is essentially identical to the new passage that the Examiner included on page 4 of the statement of the rejection in the Third Office Action. In this regard, Appellant notes that the Examiner implicitly admits that Fukuda fails to teach this limitation for which the Examiner has relied upon Fukuda to teach in both rejections. The Examiner then relies upon an obviousness argument to establish a teaching of this limitation.

In rejecting a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the Examiner is required to identify a source in the applied prior art for: (1) the claim limitations; and (2) the motivation to modify a reference in the reasonable expectation of achieving a particular benefit.<sup>1</sup> The Examiner has done neither with regard to the claimed "assigning an unfocused style to all unfocused portlets in a portal except for a focused portlet having input focus." The Examiner has already admitted that Gajewska does not teach this limitation. Moreover, the Examiner has admitted that Fukuda fails to teach this limitation. Thus, neither of the cited references supplies the source for this particular claim limitation. In addition, the Examiner has not even alleged a motivation to modify Fukuda to arrive at this claimed limitation.

Notwithstanding the Examiner making an improper obviousness assertion and the Examiner failing to address the substance of Appellant's arguments on pages 4 and 5 of the Second Response, the following review of paragraph [0064] of Fukuda clarifies the teachings of

---

<sup>1</sup> Smiths Industries Medical System v. Vital Signs Inc., 183 F.3d 1347, 51 USPQ2d 1415 (Fed. Cir. 1999).



Fukuda and why these teachings fail to teach or suggest the limitation for which Fukuda is being relied upon by the Examiner. For ease of reference, paragraph [0064] is reproduced below in its entirety:

[0064] FIG. 7 shows a display 700 of BML carousel data of a multi-screen program which is transmitted via broadcast waves. The display 700 includes the title 701 of the multi-screen program. The title 701 may be described in BML as characters or may be incorporated in BML as an image. Streaming programs are represented by frames 702. Each of the streaming programs 702 has a program title 703 which is described in BML as characters. A streaming program selected by a user is distinguished using a focus 704, and the focus 704 can be shifted by using the cursor keys 202 of the remote control unit 116. A navigation index and focus style are used to clearly show which streaming program frame 702 is focused, and to precisely describe how the focus 704 moves. The navigation index is configured such that each object is assigned an ID and the target object of the focus 704 is described using Nav-Up, Nav-Down, Nav-Left, and Nav-Right attributes. The focus style is configured such that a style sheet is used to specify the style of the focus, thus allowing a user to distinctly know where the focus 704 is applied. (emphasis added)

Referring to the first underlined sentence, the focus 704 is not applied to the frames 702 (i.e., the Examiner's alleged portlets). Instead the focus 704 is a separate object that can be separately moved using the cursor keys 202 of the remote control unit 116. As described in the second underlined sentence, the style of the focus 704 is configured using a style sheet. Absent from these teachings within Fukuda is (i) a teaching that the style sheet is applied to the frames 702 (i.e., the Examiner alleged portlets) and (ii) a teaching that an unfocused style is separately applied to the frames 702. Instead, Fukuda teaches that the style sheet is applied to the focus 704, which is a separate object from the frames 702.

---

In the paragraph spanning pages 4 and 5 of the Third Office Action, the Examiner identified the alleged teachings of Gajewska. In this regard, Appellant notes that this paragraph is essentially identical to the last full paragraph on page 3 of the Second Office Action. In the Second Response, Appellant made the following arguments with regard to these assertions by the Examiner.

Independent claim 1, in part, recites the following limitation:

responsive to a new portlet in said portal acquiring said input focus from said focused portlet, re-assigning said focused style to said new portlet while re-assigning said unfocused style to said focused portlet which no longer has input focus, and re-rendering said new portlet and said focused portlet which no longer has input focus in said portal according to said styles.

On page 3 of the Second Office Action, the Examiner cited paragraph [0021] of Gajewska to teach this limitation and asserted:

0021; Gajewska discloses a component become the focus owner when it receives a FocusGained (*input focus*) event and ceases being the focus owner when it receives a FocusLost (*unfocused*) event. Gajewska further discloses in a FocusGain event, the opposite field specifies the component that is losing focus and specified the component that is gaining focus in conjunction with the FocusLost event. (emphasis in original)

This analysis, however, completely ignores the claimed re-assigning and assigning of the "focus style" and the "unfocused style." Appellant noted this same deficiency in the Amendment filed March 8, 2006, in which Appellant argued:

Independent claim 1 recites "assigning an unfocused style" and "assigning a focused style" to certain portlets. The Examiner, however, has failed to indicate where these features are identically disclosed by Gajewska. A textual search of Gajewska fails to yield any mention of the term "style." Moreover, an search of Gajewska fails to yield any mention of assigning a style to a portlet.

On page 20 of the Second Office Action, the Examiner asserted that "Applicant's arguments with respect to independent claims 1, 6, and 12 ... are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejections," and as a result the Examiner did not feel the need to address these arguments. In this regard, reference is made to M.P.E.P. § 707.07(f), which states that even if the arguments are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection, the "examiner must, however, address any arguments presented by the applicant which are still relevant to any references being

applied" (emphasis added). Appellant's arguments that Gajewska fails to teach assigning a style to a portlet is still relevant. Therefore, the Examiner has improperly failed to address these arguments.

Referring back to Gajewska, paragraph [0021] discusses a class of Java events, named "focus events," and an edition of Java "defines a new field in its focus events: the 'opposite' field" and this opposite field specifies "the component that is gaining focus" and also specifies "where the focus is coming from." These teachings, however, are not directed to assigning particular styles to portals either having focus or losing focus (i.e., a portal which no longer has input focus). Therefore, the Examiner's citation of Gajewska to teach or suggest the above-identified claim language is improper.

The Examiner's response to these arguments in the Second Response is found in the on pages 24 and 25 of the Third Office Action and reproduced below:

Gajewska teaches a component become the focus owner when it receives a FocusGained (input focus) event and ceases being the focus owner when it receives a FocusLost (unfocused) event (0021). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art that once a FocusGained or FocusLost event occurred, implicitly, the appropriate focus style would applied to the portlet. (italics in original) (underlines added)

Furthermore, Fukuda teaches a focus style is configured such that a style sheet is used to specify the style of the focus. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art that Fukuda teaching of a focus style sheet as applied to a focused portlet could also be applied as an unfocused style sheet to an unfocused portlet (0064).

With reference to the underlined portion above, similar to the Examiner's new comments with regard to Fukuda, Appellant notes that the Examiner implicitly admits that Gajewska fails to teach this limitation for which the Examiner has relied upon Gajewska to teach in both rejections. The Examiner then relies upon an obviousness argument to establish a teaching of this limitation.

As already noted above with regard to the Examiner's "obviousness analysis" as to Fukuda, in rejecting a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the Examiner is required to identify a source in the applied prior art for: (1) the claim limitations; and (2) the motivation to modify a reference in the reasonable expectation of achieving a particular benefit. The Examiner has done neither with regard to the claimed "re-assigning said focused style to said new portlet while re-assigning said unfocused style to said focused portlet which no longer has input focus." The Examiner has already admitted that Fukuda does not teach this limitation. Moreover, the Examiner has admitted that Gajewska fails to teach this limitation. Thus, neither of the cited references supplies the source for this particular claim limitation. In addition, the Examiner has not even alleged a motivation to modify Gajewska to arrive at this claimed limitation.

The Examiner's comments in second paragraph reproduced above, are essentially identical to the Examiner's prior comments with regard to the teachings of Fukuda. However, as already noted, these comments by the Examiner as to the teachings of Fukuda are factually unsupported by the Fukuda. Therefore, not only does Fukuda fails to teach or suggest the limitations for which the Examiner is relying upon Fukuda to teach, Gajewska also fails to teach or suggest the limitations for which the Examiner is relying upon Gajewska to teach.

---

In the second full paragraph on page 5 of the Second Response, Appellant made the following remarks with regard to the Examiner's alleged motivation for modifying Gajewska in view of Fukuda:

As to the requisite motivation to combine, Applicant notes that the Examiner has failed to establish any motivation to combine Gajewska and Fukuda. In the paragraph spanning pages 4 and 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserted it would have been obvious to make the combination, but the Examiner failed to establish a reason why. Thus, the Examiner has failed to set forth a proper prima facie case of obviousness. (emphasis added)

The Examiner did not address this argument in the Third Office Action. The Examiner, however, asserted a motivation for modifying Fukuda in view of Gajewska in the first full paragraph on page 5 of the Third Office Action, which is reproduced below:

Therefore, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Fukuda with Gajewska, for the benefit of defining a focus style sheet, which is used to specify the style of the focus, thus allowing a user to distinctly know where the focus is applied (0064).

At the outset, Appellant is entirely unclear as to what this alleged motivation has anything to do with the teachings of Gajewska. The asserted "benefit of defining a focus style sheet, which is used to specify the style of the focus, thus allowing a user to distinctly know where the focus is applied (0064)" is already found in the teachings of Fukuda. In fact, the paragraph identified by the Examiner (i.e., paragraph [0064]) is found in Fukuda. As such, Appellant questions why one having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify Fukuda in view of Gajewska when the alleged benefit already resides in the teachings of Fukuda.

Thus, the Examiner has failed to establish any nexus between the teachings relied upon within Gajewska for the proposed modifications to the Fukuda and the alleged benefit. Without requiring a nexus between the proposed modification and the asserted benefit of the modification, the Examiner could assert that any possible modification taught by Gajewska could be based upon any possible benefit taught by any reference. The need for a nexus between the proposed modification and the asserted benefit of the modification is to establish that one having ordinary skill in the art would have been realistically impelled to modify the prior art in the manner suggested by the Examiner. Thus, for the reasons stated above, Appellant respectfully

submits that the Examiner has failed to set forth a prima facie case of obviousness for lack of a proper motivation to modify Fukuda in view of Gajewska.

#### Claim 6

Independent claim 6 is substantially similar to independent claim 1, and Appellant incorporates herein the arguments presented above with regard to claim 1 as also applying to claim 6. For example, the Examiner relied upon Fukuda to teach both a focused style sheet and an unfocused style sheet. However, as previously noted, Fukuda only discloses "a style sheet [that] is used to specify the style of the focus" (last line in paragraph [0064]). Thus, Fukuda is silent with regard to both a focused style sheet and an unfocused style sheet. Therefore, even if Fukuda were modified in view of Gajewska, the claimed invention would not result. Moreover, as noted above, the Examiner has failed to set forth a proper prima facie case of obviousness for failure to establish a realistic reason why one having ordinary skill in the art would modify Fukuda in view of Gajewska to arrive at the claimed invention.

#### Claim 12

Independent claim 12 is substantially similar to independent claim 1 with a difference being that claim 1 recites unfocused style and focused style whereas claim 12 recites unfocused style sheet and focused style sheet. Appellant, therefore, incorporates herein the arguments previously presented with regard to claim 1. Furthermore, Appellant incorporates herein the arguments previously presented with regard to claim 6 and how the Examiner has (i) failed to factually establish that Fukuda teaches the claimed unfocused style sheet and focused style sheet and (ii) establish a proper motivation to modify Fukuda in view of Gajewska.

**THE REJECTION OF CLAIMS 3, 5, 9, AND 14 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 FOR OBVIOUSNESS  
BASED UPON FUKUDA IN VIEW OF GAJEWSKA AND ITO**

For convenience of the Honorable Board in addressing the rejections, and claims 3, 5, 9, and 14 stand or fall together with independent claim 1.

Claims 3, 5, 9, and 14 depend from independent claims 1, 6, and 12, and Appellant incorporates herein the arguments previously advanced in traversing the imposed rejection of claims 1, 6, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for obviousness based upon Fukuda in view of Gajewska. The tertiary references to Ito does not cure the argued deficiencies of the prior rejection. Accordingly, even if one having ordinary skill in the art were motivated to combine the applied prior art, the claimed invention would not result from the combination of Fukuda, Gajewska, and Ito. Appellant, therefore, respectfully submit that the imposed rejection of claims 3, 5, 9, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for obviousness based upon Fukuda in view of Gajewska and Ito is not viable.

**THE REJECTION OF CLAIMS 4, 8, AND 15 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 FOR OBVIOUSNESS  
BASED UPON FUKUDA IN VIEW OF GAJEWSKA, ITO, AND GRIFFIN**

For convenience of the Honorable Board in addressing the rejections, and claims 4, 8, and 15 stand or fall together with independent claim 1.

Claims 4, 8, and 15 respectively depend from independent claims 1, 6, and 12, and Appellant incorporates herein the arguments previously advanced in traversing the imposed rejection of claims 1, 6, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for obviousness based upon Fukuda in view

of Gajewska. The additional references to Ito and Griffin do not cure the argued deficiencies of the prior rejection. Accordingly, even if one having ordinary skill in the art were motivated to combine the applied prior art, the claimed invention would not result from the combination of Fukuda, Gajewska, Ito, and Griffin. Appellant, therefore, respectfully submit that the imposed rejection of claims 4, 8, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for obviousness based upon Fukuda in view of Gajewska, Ito, and Griffin is not viable.

Conclusion

Based upon the foregoing, Appellant respectfully submits that the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based upon the applied prior art are not viable. Appellant, therefore, respectfully solicits the Honorable Board to reverse the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17, 41.20, and in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 09-0461, and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Date: February 28, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott D. Paul/

Scott D. Paul

Registration No. 42,984

Steven M. Greenberg

Registration No. 44,725

CUSTOMER NUMBER 46320



## **VIII. CLAIMS APPENDIX**

1. A method for indicating input focus in a portal environment, the method comprising the steps of:

assigning an unfocused style to all unfocused portlets in a portal except for a focused portlet having input focus;

further assigning a focused style to said focused portlet having input focus;

rendering said focused and unfocused portlets in said portal; and,

responsive to a new portlet in said portal acquiring said input focus from said focused portlet, re-assigning said focused style to said new portlet while re-assigning said unfocused style to said focused portlet which no longer has input focus, and re-rendering said new portlet and said focused portlet which no longer has input focus in said portal according to said styles.

2. The method of claim 1, further comprising the steps of:

defining a unique identifier in each portlet in said portal;

specifying a global focus identifier with a unique identifier of said focused portlet; and,

responsive to said new portlet in said portal acquiring said input focus, re-specifying said global focus identifier with a unique identifier of said new portlet.

3. The method of claim 2, further comprising the step of performing said re-assigning and re-rendering steps through a script embedded in said portal.

4. The method of claim 3, further comprising the steps of:

defining said portal in a markup language document;

defining a divisible section of said markup language document for each of said focused and unfocused portlets; and,

performing said assigning and further assigning steps by specifying a class attribute for each of said focused and unfocused portlets, said class attribute corresponding to a style sheet selected from the group consisting of a focused style sheet and an unfocused style sheet.

5. The method of claim 3, further comprising the step of associating said script with each event attribute in a divisible section which indicates when a corresponding one of said focused and unfocused portlets has acquired said input focus.

6. A system for indicating input focus in a portal environment, the system comprising:

a focused style sheet and an unfocused style sheet;

a portal defining a plurality of portlets, said portlets comprising a single focused portlet configured for rendering according to said focused style sheet, and a remaining set of unfocused portlets configured for rendering according to said unfocused style sheet;

a global indicator disposed within said portal specifying said single focused portlet; and,

a global script disposed within said portal programmed to change said global indicator to specify a newly focused portlet when said newly focused portlet acquires input focus from said single focused portlet, to re-render said newly focused portlet in said portal according to said focused style sheet and to re-render said single focused portlet in said portal according to said unfocused style sheet.

7. The system of claim 6, wherein said focused style sheet and unfocused style sheet are defined according to a content style sheet specification.

8. The system of claim 6, wherein said portal comprises markup comprising a plurality of divisible sections, each of said divisible sections defining a single one of said portlets.

9. The system of claim 8, wherein each of said divisible sections comprises a set of attributes, at least one of said attributes specifying a class corresponding to one of said focused style sheet and unfocused style sheet.

10. The system of claim 9, wherein at least one said attributes specifies a unique identifier for said single one of said portlets.

11. The system of claim 9, wherein at least one of said attributes associates said global script with an event which occurs when said single one of said portlets acquires user input focus.

12. A machine readable storage having stored thereon a computer program for indicating input focus in a portal environment, the computer program comprising a routine set of instructions for causing the machine to perform the steps of:

assigning an unfocused style sheet to all unfocused portlets in a portal except for a focused portlet having input focus;

further assigning a focused style sheet to said focused portlet having input focus;

rendering said focused and unfocused portlets in said portal; and,

responsive to a new portlet in said portal acquiring said input focus from said focused portlet, re-assigning said focused style sheet to said new portlet while re-assigning said unfocused style sheet to said focused portlet which no longer has input focus, and re-rendering said new portlet and said focused portlet which no longer has input focus in said portal according to said style sheets.

13. The machine readable storage of claim 12, further comprising the steps of:  
defining a unique identifier in each portlet in said portal;  
specifying a global focus identifier with a unique identifier of said focused portlet; and,  
responsive to said new portlet in said portal acquiring said input focus, re-specifying said global focus identifier with a unique identifier of said new portlet.

14. The machine readable storage of claim 13, further comprising the step of performing said re-assigning and re-rendering steps through a script embedded in said portal.

15. The machine readable storage of claim 14, further comprising the steps of:  
defining said portal in a markup language document;  
defining a divisible section of said markup language document for each of said focused and unfocused portlets; and,  
performing said assigning and further assigning steps by specifying a class attribute for each of said focused and unfocused portlets, said class attribute corresponding to a style sheet selected from the group consisting of said focused style sheet and said unfocused style sheet.

16. The machine readable storage of claim 14, further comprising the step of associating said script with each event attribute in a divisible section which indicates when a corresponding one of said focused and unfocused portlets has acquired said input focus.

**IX. EVIDENCE APPENDIX**

No evidence submitted pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.130, 1.131, or 1.132 of this title or of any other evidence entered by the Examiner has been relied upon by Appellant in this Appeal, and thus no evidence is attached hereto.

**X. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX**

Since Appellant is unaware of any related appeals and interferences, no decision rendered by a court or the Board is attached hereto.